UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/627,252	07/28/2000	Joseph Skeffington Wholey III	07470-050001	2390

7590 09/12/2003

Kenyon S Jenckes
Fish & Richardson PC
4350 La Jolla Village Drive Suite 500
San Diago, CA 92122

EXAMINER	
AMINI, JAVID A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	11

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/627,252	WHOLEY III ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Javid A Amini	2672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 July 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *4* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 11, 2003 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 9, 12-16, 22, 25-29, 35, 38 and 39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheard et al.

1. Claim 1,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 18 and 20 illustrate the step of "a method for executing a graph having vertices representing components and links between components indicating flows of data between such components the graph having components with parameters, including: Sheard et al. in Fig. 21 illustrate the step of (a) retrieving a runtime parameter for the graph at runtime execution of the graph, the runtime parameter having a value defined as determinable at runtime execution of the graph", Sheard et al. in col. 3, lines 44-50 teach the step of "(b) determining whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be provided by user input", Sheard et al. in col.

24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(c) displaying a prompt to a user for receiving user input for every runtime parameter so determined". Sheard et al. in col. 25, lines 34-50 teach the step of "(d) determining a first final parameter value based on user response to such prompt", and also Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(e) executing the graph using the first final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter". But Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the use of first final parameter value. However in view of common knowledge in the art regarding "first final parameter value" that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to determine/execute or recognize "first final parameter value". Such recognition would correspond to the mental steps performed by the user engaged in the process of analyzing the control of computations of their parameterized data flow graphs.

2. Claim 2,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 12 and 13, box 332 teach the step of "(a) determining whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be externally supplied programmatically", Sheard et al. in Figs. 12 and 13, box 332 teach the step of (b) retrieving any externally supplied value for every runtime parameter so determined", Sheard et al. in Figs. 12 and 13, box 332 teach the step of "(c) determining a second final parameter value based on such externally supplied value". The step is obvious because executing the graph can be done n times (d) executing the graph using the second final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter".

3. Claim 3,

Sheard et al. in abstract teach the step of "providing an interface, which permits designating a parameter of a graph component as a runtime parameter".

4. Claim 9,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 18 and 20 illustrate the step of "a method for modifying a graph at runtime execution of the graph, having vertices representing components and links between components indicating flows of data between such components the graph having components with parameters, including: Sheard et al. in Fig. 21 illustrate the step of "(a) determining at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being a conditional component having a condition and a condition interpretation". Sheard et al. in col. 3, lines 44-50 teach the step of "(b) evaluating the condition for every such conditional component". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(c) modifying the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding condition-interpretation of such conditional component". But Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the use of first final parameter value. However in view of common knowledge in the art regarding "first final parameter value" that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to determine/execute or recognize "first final parameter value". Such recognition would correspond to the mental steps performed by the user engaged in the process of analyzing the control of computations of their parameterized data flow graphs.

5. Claim 12,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 23 and 24 teach the step of "wherein modifying the graph includes replacing the conditional component with a flow before execution of the graph based on a second evaluation of the condition and the corresponding condition interpretation for such conditional component".

6. Claim 13,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 23 and 24 teach the step of "further including an interface which permits designating a condition and a condition interpretation for a graph component".

7. Claim 14,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 18 and 20 illustrate the step of "a system for executing a graph, having vertices representing components and links between components indicating flows of data between such components the graph having components with parameters, including: Sheard et al. in Fig. 21 illustrate the step of "(a) means for retrieving a runtime parameter for the graph at runtime execution of the graph, the runtime parameter having a value defined as determinable at runtime execution of the graph". Sheard et al. in col. 3, lines 44-50 teach the step of "(b) means for determining whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be provided by user input". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(c) means for displaying a prompt to a user for receiving user input for every runtime parameter so determined". Sheard et al. in col. 25, lines 34-50 teach the step of "(d) means for determining a first final parameter value based on user response to such prompt". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(e) means for executing the graph using the first final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter". But Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the use of first final parameter value. However in view of common knowledge in the art regarding "first final parameter value" that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to determine/execute or recognize "first final parameter value". Such recognition would correspond to the mental steps performed by the user engaged in the process of analyzing the control of computations of their parameterized data flow graphs.

8. Claim 15,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 12 and 13, box 332 teach the step of "(a) means for determining whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be externally supplied programmatically". Sheard et al. in Figs. 12 and 13, box 332 teach the step of "(b) means for retrieving any externally supplied value for every runtime parameter so determined". Sheard et al. in Figs. 12 and 13, box 332 teach the step of "(c) means for determining a second final parameter value based on such externally supplied value". The step is obvious because executing the graph can be done n times "(d) means for executing the graph using the second final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter".

9. Claim 16,

Sheard et al. in abstract teach the step of "further including an interface which permits designating a parameter of a graph component as a runtime parameter".

10. Claim 22,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 18 and 20 illustrate the step of "a system for modifying a graph at runtime execution of the graph, the graph having vertices representing components with parameters and links between components indicating flows of data between such components the system including: Sheard et al. in Fig. 21 illustrate the step of "(a) means for determining at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being a conditional component having a condition and a condition-interpretation", Sheard et al. in col. 3, lines 44-50 teach the step of "(b) means for evaluating the condition for every such conditional component". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(c) means for modifying the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding condition-interpretation of such conditional component". But Sheard et al. do not

explicitly teach the use of first final parameter value. However in view of common knowledge in the art regarding "first final parameter value" that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to determine/execute or recognize "first final parameter value". Such recognition would correspond to the mental steps performed by the user engaged in the process of analyzing the control of computations of their parameterized data flow graphs.

11. Claim 25,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 23 and 24 teach the step of "wherein the means for modifying the graph includes means for replacing the conditional component with a flow before execution of the graph based on a second evaluation of the condition and the corresponding condition-interpretation for such conditional component".

12. Claim 26,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 23 and 24 teach the step of "further including an interface which permits designating a condition and a condition-interpretation for a graph component".

13. Claim 27,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 18 and 20 illustrate the step of "a computer program, stored on a computer-readable medium, for executing a graph having vertices representing components and links between components indicating flows of data between such components the graph having components with parameters, the computer program comprising instructions for causing a computer to: Sheard et al. in Fig. 21 illustrate the step of "(a) retrieve a runtime parameter for the graph at runtime execution of the graph, the runtime parameter having a value defined as determinable at runtime execution of the graph". Sheard et al. in col. 3, lines 44-50 teach the step of "(b) determine whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be provided by user input".

Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(c) display a prompt to a user for receiving user input for every runtime parameter so determined". Sheard et al. in col. 25, lines 34-50 teach the step of "(d) determine a first final parameter value based on user response to such prompt". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(e) execute the graph using the first final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter". But Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the use of first final parameter value. However in view of common knowledge in the art regarding "first final parameter value" that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to determine/execute or recognize "first final parameter value". Such recognition would correspond to the mental steps performed by the user engaged in the process of analyzing the control of computations of their parameterized data flow graphs.

14. Claim 28,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 12 and 13, box 332 teach the step of "(a) determine whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be externally supplied programmatically". Sheard et al. in Figs. 12 and 13, box 332 teach the step of "(b) retrieve any externally supplied value for every runtime parameter so determined". in (col. 41, lines 49-67) retrieving external sources can be determined. Sheard et al. in Figs. 12 and 13, box 332 teach the step of "(c) determine a second final parameter value based on such externally supplied value". in Fig. 11 indicated the comparison between the first and second parameter value.

The step is obvious because executing the graph can be done n times "(d) execute the graph using the second final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter".

15. Claim 29,

Sheard et al. in abstract teach the step of "further including instructions for causing the computer to provide an interface which permits designating a parameter of a graph component as a runtime parameter".

16. Claim 35,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 18 and 20 illustrate the step of "a computer program, stored on a computer-readable medium, for modifying a graph at runtime execution of the graph, the graph having vertices representing with components and links between components indicating flows of data between such components the computer program comprising instructions for causing a computer to: Sheard et al. in Fig. 21 illustrate the step of "(a) determine at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being a conditional component having a condition and a condition interpretation". Sheard et al. in col. 3, lines 44-50 teach the step of "(b) evaluate the condition for every such conditional component". Sheard et al. in col. 24, lines 45-50 teach the step of "(c) modify the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding condition-interpretation of such conditional component". But Sheard et al. do not explicitly teach the use of first final parameter value. However in view of common knowledge in the art regarding "first final parameter value" that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to determine/execute or recognize "first final parameter value". Such recognition would correspond to the mental steps performed by the user engaged in the process of analyzing the control of computations of their parameterized data flow graphs.

17. Claim 38,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 23 and 24 teach the step of "wherein the instructions for causing the computer to modify the graph include instructions for causing the computer to replace the conditional component with a flow before execution of the graph based on a second evaluation of the condition and the corresponding condition-interpretation for such conditional component".

18. Claim 39,

Sheard et al. in Figs. 23 and 24 teach the step of "further including instructions for causing the computer to provide an interface which permits designating a condition and a condition interpretation for a graph component".

Claims 4-8, 10, 11, 17-21, 23, 24, 30-34 and 36-37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheard et al., and further in view of Amado.

19. Claim 4,

Sheard et al. does not explicitly specify the step of "wherein determining the first final parameter value includes evaluating an expression". However, Amado in (col. 35, lines 1-6) teaches evaluating an expression. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

20. Claim 5,

Sheard et al. in (col. 3, lines 27-44) teach the step of "the expression computes metadata".

21. Claim 6,

Sheard et al. does not explicitly specify the step of "wherein determining the second final parameter value includes evaluating an expression", However, Amado in (col. 35, lines 1-6) teaches evaluating an expression. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

22. Claim 7,

Sheard et al. in (col. 3, lines 27-44) teach the step of "the expression computes metadata".

23. Claim 8,

Sheard et al. does not explicitly specify the step of "displaying the prompt depends upon evaluation of user input to a prior displayed prompt". However, Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

24. Claim 10,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step, "wherein modifying the graph includes removing the conditional component and all connected flows to such conditional component from the graph before execution of the graph based on a first evaluation of the condition and the corresponding condition-interpretation for such conditional component". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

25. Claim 11,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step, "further including removing each component and flows connected to such components that depend on the presence of the conditional component". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

26. Claim 17,

Amado in (col. 35, lines 1-6) teaches evaluating an expression. "wherein the means for determining the first final parameter value includes means for evaluating an expression". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

27. Claim 18,

Sheard et al. in (col. 3, lines 27-44) teach the step of "wherein the expression computes metadata".

28. Claim 19,

Amado in (col. 35, lines 1-6) teaches evaluating an expression "wherein the means for determining the second final parameter value includes means for evaluating an expression". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

29. Claim 20,

Sheard et al. in (col. 3, lines 27-44) teach the step of "Wherein the expression computes metadata".

30. Claim 21,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step "wherein a prompt for receiving user input is conditional, and displaying the prompt depends upon evaluation of user input to a prior displayed prompt". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

31. Claim 23,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step, "wherein the means for modifying the graph includes means for removing the conditional component and all connected flows to such conditional component from the graph before execution of the graph based on a first evaluation of the condition and the corresponding condition-interpretation for such conditional component". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

32. Claim 24,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step, "further including means for removing each component and flows connected to such components that depend on the presence of the conditional component". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

33. Claim 30,

Amado in (col. 35, lines 1-6) teaches evaluating an expression. "wherein the instructions for causing the computer to determine the first final parameter value include instructions for causing the computer to evaluating an expression". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

34. Claim 31,

Sheard et al. in (col. 3, lines 27-44) teach the step of "wherein the expression computes metadata".

35. Claim 32,

Sheard et al. does not explicitly specify the step of "wherein the instructions for causing the computer to determine the second final parameter value include instructions for causing the computer to evaluating an expression", However, Amado in (col. 35, lines 1-6) teaches evaluating an expression. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

36. Claim 33,

Amado in (col. 35, lines 1-6) teaches evaluating an expression. "wherein the expression computes metadata". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

37. Claim 34,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step of "wherein a prompt for receiving user input is conditional, and displaying the prompt depends upon evaluation of user input to a prior displayed prompt". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

38. Claim 36,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step, "wherein the instructions for causing the computer to modify the graph include instructions for causing the computer to remove the conditional component and all connected flows to such conditional component from the graph before execution of the graph based on a first evaluation of the condition and the corresponding condition-interpretation for such conditional component". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

39. Claim 37,

Amado in (col. 13, lines 18-40) teaches the step, "further including instructions for causing the computer to remove each component and flows connected to such components that depend on the presence of the conditional component". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Amado into Sheard et al. in order to modify the Sheard et Al.'s invention to generates diagnostics that are user definable interpretations of information in the database. Since this provides more options with existing databases and all information and diagnostics instantly. No intermediate steps need to be taken. Information is always live. Even if all data changed, users would get the whole new data set immediately.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Javid A Amini whose telephone number is 703-605-4248. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on 703-305-4713. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-8705 for regular communications and 703-746-8705 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Javid A Amini
Examiner
Art Unit 2672

Javid Amini
September 2, 2003

JEFFERY BRIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER